

Contractor Performance Assessment Report Training

CPAR

- Background
- Philosophy
- Objectives
- Process/Procedures
- Responsible Parties
- Evaluation Areas
- Rating Scheme
- Summary

Background

- FAR Part 42 requires collection of past performance info (PPI)
- FAR Part 15 requires use of PPI in source selection
- SAF/AQC directed paperless contracting initiative using NAVY CPARS tool to collect PPI data
- Performance reports flow to DoD's Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS)

Objectives

- Ensure current and readily available PPI for use in source selection decisions
- Aids in awarding contracts that consistently provide quality services, on time that conform to requirements within cost parameters
- Used to communicate strengths and weaknesses to source selection officials

Process Overview

- Evaluators observe and document performance, good and bad, during entire reporting period
- Evaluators submit performance reports periodically thru cross functional management group (i.e. BRAG) to Assessing Official
- AO provides a mid-term report to Contractor
- Hold mid-term BRAG to discuss performance with contractor
- At end of performance period, AO gathers evaluator reports

Process Overview, cont.

- Contractor submits self-evaluation to BRAG
- AO report finalized and input to CPARS
- Contractor concurs or comments
 - Concur – report finalized and flows to PPIRS
 - Nonconcur – response by Reviewing Official then to PPIRS
- Reports flow to PPIRS for Source Selection

Responsible Parties

Focal Points, Evaluators, Assessing Official, Reviewing Official,
Contractor

- Focal Points
- Evaluators
 - QAE, AO, ACO, PCO
- Assessing Official
- Reviewing Official
- Contractor

Responsible Parties

Focal Points, Evaluators, Assessing Official, Reviewing Official,
Contractor

Installation focal points

- Provide training for other parties
- Input contracts
- Grant CPARS access as required
- Establish and monitor reporting milestones

HQ focal points

- MAJCOM policy, guidance, oversight, training
- Who are they?
 - » Kay Leaphart
 - » Mary Stefanos

Responsible Parties

Focal Points, **Evaluators**, Assessing Official, Reviewing Official,
Contractor

Evaluators

- Observe and document performance successes/problems
- Determine strengths and weaknesses
- Deficiencies must be related to performance standards established in the contract
- Periodic reports and annual evaluation to Assessing Official

Responsible Parties

Focal Points, Evaluators, **Assessing Official**, Reviewing Official,
Contractor

Assessing Official

- Open dialog between AO and contractor encouraged throughout the performance period – May be facilitated via a mid-term report to the contractor
- Assesses overall performance based on evaluator inputs
- Final determination for each CPAR area

Responsible Parties

Focal Points, Evaluators, Assessing Official, **Reviewing Official**,
Contractor

Reviewing Official

- Senior level manager at least one level above Assessing Official
- Involvement required if disagreement between contractor and AO assessment

Responsible Parties

Focal Points, Evaluators, Assessing Official, Reviewing Official,
Contractor

Contractor

- Control access to CPAR within and outside organization
- Never reference CPAR data for advertising, promotional materials or pre-award surveys
- May non-concur on CPAR and submit rebuttal for comments by Reviewing Official

Evaluation Criteria

- Strengths and weaknesses based on objective data, preferably established standards
 - Contract management data
 - Customer comments/surveys
 - Quality reviews
 - Functional performance reviews
 - Cost performance reports
- Data must be measurable
 - Cause or ramifications
 - Not speculation/conjecture

Evaluation Criteria

- Inputs
 - Supporting narrative rationale with FACTS to detail specific areas of evaluation
 - Description of success or problem experienced
 - Who caused problem (govt, ktr, other factors)
 - How well did ktr work with govt to resolve
 - Focus on co-op spirit of ktr in identifying/resolving
 - Focus on the end result; not means to get there
 - Timeliness of identification of issue, problems or successes with critical subcontractors

Evaluation Criteria

- Inputs
 - Don't lower rating based solely on Contract Disputes Act claims by contractor
 - Don't evaluate lower than satisfactory rating solely for not performing ABOVE the contract requirements

Evaluation Criteria

- Adjectives for Ratings
 - Exceptional: exceeds many standards, no deficiencies
 - Very Good: meets, exceeds some standards, no significant weaknesses
 - Satisfactory: complete, accurate, complies with standards, no major deficiencies
 - Marginal: some serious unresolved problems
 - Unsatisfactory: incomplete, inaccurate, fails, major deficiencies

Rating Scheme

Exceptional, Very Good, Satisfactory, Marginal,
Unsatisfactory

- Exceptional
 - Performance MEETS contractual requirements AND EXCEEDS MANY to the Government's benefit
 - FEW MINOR problems for which corrective actions TAKEN by the contractor were HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
 - MULTIPLE SIGNIFICANT events with demonstrated benefit to Govt OR SINGULAR event of substantial MAGNITUDE
 - NO SIGNIFICANT weaknesses identified

Rating Scheme

Exceptional, **Very Good**, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unsatisfactory

- Very Good
 - Performance MEETS contractual requirements and EXCEEDS SOME to the Government's benefit
 - SOME MINOR problems for which corrective action taken by contractor were EFFECTIVE
 - SIGNIFICANT event with demonstrated benefit to Govt
 - NO SIGNIFICANT weaknesses

Rating Scheme

Exceptional, Very Good, **Satisfactory**, Marginal,
Unsatisfactory

- Satisfactory
 - Performance MEETS contractual requirements
 - SOME MINOR problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor APPEAR OR WERE satisfactory
 - Major problems, but with contractor recovery without impact to the contract
 - NO SIGNIFICANT weaknesses

Rating Scheme

Exceptional, Very Good, Satisfactory, **Marginal**, Unsatisfactory

- Marginal
 - Performance does NOT MEET SOME contractual requirements
 - SERIOUS problem for which contractor has not yet identified corrective action
 - PROPOSED action appears only MARGINALLY EFFECTIVE or were NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED
 - Identified SIGNIFICANT event and impact to the Govt

Rating Scheme

Exceptional, Very Good, Satisfactory, Marginal,
Unsatisfactory

- Unsatisfactory
 - Performance does NOT MEET MOST contractual requirements and RECOVERY NOT LIKELY in a timely manner
 - SERIOUS problems which the contractor's corrective actions APPEAR or WERE INEFFECTIVE
 - Identified MULTIPLE SIGNIFICANT events and impact to the Govt or one SERIOUS problem
 - Potential for default

SUMMARY

- CPARS results in PPIRS data
- Major evaluation tool for source selection among all DoD components
- Make them as accurate and complete as YOU would need to accurately assess past performance for YOUR source selection